18 April 1950

Points to be discussed with Colonel ████   STATINTL

1. I have read, and agree with the comments appearing in your memorandum concerning points to be discussed with Colonel ████ It has occurred to me that the following comments are pertinent to your proposed discussion.

a. There appears to be a not inconsiderable lack of knowledge on the part of case officers with respect to the various categories of personnel. It is not uncommon to have case officers inquire as to the difference, for example, between staff agents and contract agents. The security aspects of these categories also appear to be unknown, particularly the difference between full and limited clearances.

b. I have noticed that the more experienced or "old hands" have a tendency to disappear from the case officer category and to be replaced by newly appointed personnel or "new hands." This is not to say that all problems are soluble by "old hands" for there are occasions where even operational experience does not equip an individual with a sufficient fund of knowledge to analyze or anticipate administrative or legal consequences, but rather to say that minimum standards of continuity of personnel and experience should be maintained as an operating principle. Certainly the responsibility of the case officer is not one that should or can be assumed lightly through casual administrative practices. In short, "new hands" on old matters don't help.

c. Paralleling the foregoing observation is the one that case officers appear to have an unfortunate and evanescent existence. It can only be assumed that the "case officer status" in some instances appears to have become the accepted "on the job training assignment" for newly appointed personnel. When the individual becomes equipped with satisfactory "know-how" the hour of departure to other administrative activities has arrived. The basic objection from an Agency standpoint obviously is an unnecessary consumption of time in explanation and re-explanation.